7th ETV CCEP Stakeholders Meeting Summary
November 9, 2000

EPA Environmental Research Center, Research Triangle Park, NC

Attendees
Stakeholders

- George Bryant, Briggs & Stratton
- Bob Carter, North Carolina EPA/Waste Reduction Resource Center (EPA)
- Lyle Gilbert, MetoKote
- Carl Izzo, Industrial Paint Consultant
- Rick Klein, Iowa Waste Reduction Center
- Michael Kosusko, U.S. EPA/NRMRL
- Larry Melgary, Northern Coatings and Chemical Company, Chemical Coaters Association International
- Eugene Praschan, Environmental and Coatings Consultant (Automotive, ASTM)
- Alex Ross, RadTech International
- Dave Salman, U.S. EPA/OAQPS
- David Sanders, U.S. EPA/OAQPS
- Brian Schweitzer, Concurrent Technologies Corporation
- Shirley Wasson, U.S. EPA/NRMRL

Technology Presentations

- Results and reactions to verification results (presented by Rick Klein, IWRC)
- Airmix® spray gun, Kremlin, Inc. (presented by Michael Michalski)
- KZ 1007 UV-curable coating, Allied PhotoChemical (presented by Roy C. Krohn and Dr. Joseph Roehl)
- Development and marketing difficulties (presented by Bror Hanson, Polymerit Corporation) ·
- Polymerit Release Powder mold release agent, Polymerit Corporation (presented by Bror Hanson) ·
- Near-zero VOC baking enamel coating, Finishes Unlimited, Inc. (presented by Hank Godshalk) ·
- Tagnite® magnesium coating system, Technology Applications Group, Inc. (presented by Dr. Bill Gorman) ·
- -in-1 Pretreatment System, Pressure Island (presented by George Strapko) ·
- Two-component and UV-curable waterborne polyurethanes, Bayer Corp. (presented by Dr. Sharon Feng) ·
- MSC Powder Cloud™ coil coating system, MSC Prefinish Metals, Inc. (presented by Leon Li)

Observers

- Robert Fisher, Concurrent Technologies Corporation
- Michelle Mandolia, ICF Consulting
- Julie Napotnick, Concurrent Technologies Corporation
- ClarLynda Williams, U.S. EPA/NRMRL, Intern

Meeting Summary

Mr. Brian Schweitzer opened the meeting with welcomes and introductions of the stakeholders, presenters, and observers. He reviewed the agenda and noted the schedule dates for the next Stakeholder meeting.

Mr. Michael Kosusko gave the presenters a brief description of the ETV CCEP's goals and background. Mr. Lyle Gilbert asked Mr. Kosusko to describe the anticipated advantages the ETV CCEP verifications will provide the vendors. Mr. Kosusko described the benefits to the vendors as third-party, unbiased data on the technologies environmental and performance characteristics. Dr. Alex Ross asked if the ETV CCEP would verify a vendors claims. Mr. Schweitzer stated that claims can be included in the verification testing if requested by the vendor, and that the ETV CCEP generally does not try to disprove a technologies marketing claims. Dr. Joseph Roehl asked if the ETV CCEP would accept existing data and/or try to duplicate lab tests. Mr. Kosusko stated that the ETV CCEP does not accept existing data, but may duplicate previous lab test conditions if the level of quality is consistent with the ETV CCEP's goals. Mr. Michael Michalski asked about the presentation of cost and performance data in the verification reports. Mr. Kosusko stated that the cost and performance information is included in the verification reports and statements to provide the end users with information that will assist them in determining whether the technology is appropriate for their application. Mr. Roy C. Krohn asked about the methods used during theverification tests where there are no existing ASTM methods appropriate to the technology. Mr. Eugene Praschan noted that ASTM methods could be developed to meet the technology's needs. Mr. Larry Melgary informed the group of the Jane Bailey, editorial in the October 2000 edition of the Industrial Paint & Powder magazine. And, Mr. Bob Carter invited presenters to list their technologies in the Waste Reduction Resource Center's vendor database.

Presentations

Mr. Rick Klein discussed the reactions to the Laser Touch™ verification results and the effect the verification has had on the marketing of the product. Mr. Klein noted that the pollution prevention findings appear to be the most valuable results to the end-users. He highlighted an immediate increased sales upon release of the Laser Touch™ Verification Report, which continues to be sustained.

Mr. Michael Michalski described the Airmix® technology and discussed the difference between the Airmix® and typical air-assisted airless spray equipment.

Mr. Roy C. Krohn and Dr. Joseph Roehl described the KZ 1007 coating. The KZ 1007 is 100% UV-curable, which means that the coating contains essentially no volatile solvents.

Mr. Bror Hanson discussed the difficulties his company has encountered during the development and marketing of Polymerit's low-VOC mold release agent. Mr. Hanson then described the Polymerit Release Powder and its application.

Mr. Hank Godshalk described Finishes Unlimited, Inc.'s efforts to develop near-zero VOC coatings, including an extremely low-VOC baking enamel. He is concerned that EPA Method 24 is not accurate for near-zero VOC coatings, making it difficult to verify the VOC content of Finishes Unlimited, Inc.'s low-VOC products. He also asked us to help identify regulatory benefits for users of near-zero VOC coatings that are well below regulatory limits

Dr. Bill Gorman described the Tagnite® coating for anodizing magnesium components. Tagnite® contains no chromates or permanganates.

Mr. George Strapko described Pressure Island's 3-in-1 Pretreatment System, which is a portable, closed-loop, degreasing, cleaning, pretreatment station.

Dr. Sharon Feng, described the two-component and UV-curable waterborne polyurethane coatings that are produced using Bayer's raw materials. She noted that there is a disconnect between the availability of low-VOC resins and the manufacture of low-VOC, compliant coatings.

Mr. Leon Li described the MSC Powder Cloud™, which is a coil coating process that has high powder coating deposition efficiency, a high degree of dry film thickness (DFT) control, and reduced amount of coating wastes.

Closing Statements

Several Stakeholders asked how they would be involved in getting new vendors through the verification process. Mr. Schweitzer stated that the ETV CCEP will continue submitting Protocols and technology-specific Testing and Quality Assurance Project Plans to the Stakeholders for review and comment.

Next Meeting

Consensus was reached that there will be three stakeholder meetings in 2001: the first will be held in March, exact date to be determined, at the U.S. EPA's RTP, NC, facility, the second will be held on June 4 th in conjunction with the Finishing 2001 conference in Rosemont (Chicago), IL, and the third will be held in October, exact date to be determined, in conjunction with the Coating 2001 conference, October 15-17, in Orlando, FL. Further details will be posted on the ETV Web site. Mr. Schweitzer stated that the upcoming meetings would consist of more presentations from verified technologies and potential vendors. As requested by the stakeholders, a block of rooms will be identified for future meetings.